



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,832	02/05/2004	Joseph E. Phillips	CM05200H	6002

22917 7590 11/01/2005

MOTOROLA, INC.
1303 EAST ALGONQUIN ROAD
IL01/3RD
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196

EXAMINER

CHANG, RICHARD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2663

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/772,832

Applicant(s)

PHILLIPS ET AL.

Examiner

Richard Chang

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/12/2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments and amendments, filed on 08/12/2005, with respect to claims 1-12 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by US patent No. 5,570,366 ("Baker et al.").

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Baker et al. teach a system and method for handling multicast/broadcast by the access points over IP (See Fig. 4) comprising of

at an Access Point (See Fig. 2, with AP module, table management module, both wired and wireless ports),

receiving a multicast packet intended for a particular multicast group,

determining (checking the table) whether there is at least one wireless subscriber unit (mobile terminal) belonging to the particular multicast group and associated with the access point, and

rebroadcasting the multicast packet over a wired segment (high speed wired LAN) (See Fig. 4),

rebroadcasting the multicast packet over a wireless segment (wireless LAN) only if there is at least one wireless subscriber unit (mobile terminal) belonging to the particular multicast group and associated with the access point (filtering enabled) (See Fig. 8, Col. 4, line 62 – Col. 5, line 35).

Regarding claim 2, this claim has limitation that is similar to those of claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 3, Baker et al. further teach that consulting a storage medium (table management module), wherein the storage medium comprises a list (table) of wireless subscriber units (mobile terminal) along with their membership to at least one multicast group and whether the subscriber unit is currently associated with the access point (defined by parameters) (See Fig. 8, Col. 4, line 62 – Col. 5, line 35).

Regarding claim 4, Baker et al. further teach the step of updating the storage medium (table) by detecting Internet Group Management Protocol messages (IP message frame) from wireless subscriber units (mobile terminal) (See Fig. 8, Col. 4, line 62 – Col. 5, line 35).

Regarding claim 5, Baker et al. further teach the step of updating the storage medium (table) by receiving Inter-Access Point Protocol messages (hand off frames between two Access Points) from at least a second access point (See Fig. 7, Col. 8, lines 24-36).

Regarding claim 6, Baker et al. further teach step of updating the storage medium (table) by removing an entry from the storage medium (table) based on inactivity from a wireless subscriber unit (mobile terminal) after a predetermined period of time lapses (See Col. 6, lines 55–58).

Regarding claim 7, this claim has limitation that is similar to those of claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 9-10, this claims have limitation that is similar to those of claim 8, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

Regarding claim 11, Baker et al. further teach that the multicast packet is originated from a wireless subscriber unit (A) (See Fig. 4, Col. 3, lines 24– 34).

Regarding claim 12, Baker et al. further teach that at a subscriber unit (See Fig 4, mobile terminal A) generating a multicast packet intended for a particular multicast group, setting a first value (ID field ...) within the multicast packet if the subscriber unit (mobile terminal) desires a rebroadcast of the multicast packet (filtering enabled), otherwise setting a second value (filtering disabled) within the multicast packet, and transmitting the multicast packet (See Fig. 6, Col. 3, line 57 – Col. 4, line 24).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3129. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

Art Unit: 2663

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AC
rkc

Richard Chang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2663

[Signature]
10/5/08
DERRICK FERRIS
PATENT EXAMINER